

he urged that as the responsibilities and functions of the Tester have increased, an allowance of Rs. 15 per month should be paid to every Tester made to look after both Cell and Synthesis Plants with retrospective effect, i.e., from the date of such employment. The Management representative explained that there was no justification for the demand, as these Testers were not working any extra hours beyond the stipulated period, and that the Management could not agree to pay any allowance. The Labour representative pressed the demand but the Management could not accept.

### III. NOTICE OF CHANGE WITH ONE DEMAND.

The demand was that the workers of this industry though worked for 48 hours in a week of 7 days they were getting wages only for 6 days and that they should be paid another day's wages every week :—The Labour representative explained the demand and stated that as per Section 34 of the Mysore Factories Act, as amended from time to time, the employees have worked since 16th September 1946 for 48 hours in every week but have been paid six days' pay and wage as a week's pay or wages, and so, they should be paid a day's pay or wages in every week from 16th September 1946. The Management representative stated that there was no such thing existing in the other industrial concerns and the demand cannot be accepted. The Labour representative still pressed the demand, but the Management regretted that the demand could not be agreed to.

### IV. NOTICE OF CHANGE WITH ONE DEMAND.

The demand refers to the working hours in the Factory :—The Labour representative urged that the working hours of the employees of the company shall be so arranged as to facilitate 48 hours of work per week of seven days as per Section III, para 13 of the Standing Orders. The Management representative replied that they were adopting 48 hours a week and that whenever overtime work was taken, Overtime Allowance, as per the Act, was being paid, and that such a thing as is now demanded by the Association is not in vogue even in Government owned industries, and that, as such, the demand could not be accepted. The Labour representative pressed the demand, but the Management could not accept.

### V. NOTICE OF CHANGE WITH ONE DEMAND.

The demand refers to the reinstatement of one Mr. Ramachandra Sastry, who was working in the Canteen of the Company.—The Labour representative stated that the order of suspension passed in the case of this worker and for the loss of certain coupon books was unjustified and he should be taken back unconditionally. The Management representative stated that the reinstatement had been ordered but the worker did not turn up. The Labour representative refuted this by saying that the order of reinstatement was coupled with unhealthy conditions, and that no charges were proved against him and that the order requiring him to pay certain amount was not justified and that he should be taken back unconditionally. The Management representative at this stage referred to a letter (dated February 10th, 1948) from the Management to the Association. The position of the matter, as stated therein by the Management is thus :—

".....we (Management) are going into the details re: the cash deficit and shall write to you in a couple of days.

The loss of coupons referred to in the memo do refer to the incident of the coupon books been lost but refers to the utilisation of cc by distributing the same to the members accounted for. As regards monies collected some members and not credited, Mr. chandra Sastry has himself agreed to make such monies.

The matter is being further looked into carefully the exact amount to be made good by Mr. chandra Sastry will be intimated to you. While, as already directed by raising the suspension order, Mr. Ramachandra Sastry should immediately report himself for duty."

The Labour representative stated that the Auditors audited the accounts, had exonerated the worker and as the worker should be taken back unconditionally. Management representative explained that the matter is further looked into and that the worker himself had agreed to make good the amount, and that in the meanwhile the order of his suspension had been revised, but that he (worker) not reported himself for duty.

Yet, the Association representative pressed the demand. The Management representative stated that final orders in the case against this worker could be made only after completion of the enquiry, and that pending final orders, the worker had been ordered to be reinstated to duty and that the demand for unconditional reinstatement could not be agreed to.

All possible ways of settlement were explored, but parties did not come to any settlement in regard to any of the above demands.

The conciliation in regard to these demands thus ended failure, which I hereby report.

I request that this report may be published in the Gazette as required in Sub-Section (4) of Section 12 of the Mysore Labour Act.

I have the honour to be  
Sir,

Your most obedient servant

NAVANEETHAM,

Chief Conciliator in Mysore

### LAW SECRETARIAT

Dated 17th March 1948.

No. R. L. 236—R. A. 53-47-3. In pursuance of the provisions of sub-rule (2) of rule 83 of the Mysore Constituent Assembly Election Rules, 1948, the name of the member elected to the Mysore Constituent Assembly for the constituency specified below is hereby notified.

#### Part II—General Constituencies—Depressed Classes

Sl. No.	Name of the constituency	Name and address of the member
1	Mysore District including Mysore City.	Mr. M. Madiab, Deputy President, Legislative Council, 1 Village, Nanjangud Taluk

S. KANAKARATNARAJ,  
Legal Remembrancer and Law Secretary

7174